

Interplay between electron pairing and Dicke effect in triple quantum dots structures

S. Głodzik* and T. Domański†

Institute of Physics, M. Curie Skłodowska University, 20-031 Lublin, Poland

(Dated: November 16, 2016)

We study influence of the proximity-induced pairing an electronic version of the Dicke effect in heterostructure, consisting of three quantum dots vertically coupled to the metallic and superconducting leads. We discuss protocol for feasible experimental measurement of the narrow/broad (subradiant/superradiant) contributions by means of the subgap Andreev spectroscopy. In the Kondo regime and for small energy detuning we predict that the zero-bias conductance is going to be amplified by the Dicke effect.

PACS numbers: 73.23.-b, 73.21.La, 72.15.Qm, 74.45.+c

I. INTRODUCTION

Triple quantum dots embedded between reservoirs of mobile electrons enable realization of the electronic Dicke effect¹. Original phenomenon, known in quantum optics, manifests itself by the narrow (*subradiant*) and broad (*superradiant*) lineshapes spontaneously emitted by atoms linked on a distance smaller than a characteristic wavelength². Early prototypes for its electronic counterpart have been discussed by several groups^{3–7}.

In nanostructures, comprising the central quantum dot (QD₀) and two side-attached ones (QD_{±1}) arranged in a crossed bar configuration (depicted in Fig. 1), the sub- and superradiant contributions can be achieved either upon increasing the interdot coupling $t_{±1}$ or via tuning the quantum dot energy levels $\epsilon_{±1} - \epsilon_0$. This issue has been extensively discussed for the junctions with both normal (conducting) electrodes^{8–13}. In particular, there has been studied interplay between the Kondo and Dicke effects (observable in the differential conductance)^{10,11} and it has been shown that the electronic Dicke effect can substantially enhance the thermoelectric properties, leading to violation of the Wiedemann-Franz law¹³.

Certain aspects of the electronic Dicke effect have been also confronted with superconductivity, considering the Andreev^{14–17} and Josephson-type^{18,19} spectroscopies. However, to the best of our knowledge, any systematic description of interplay between the proximity induced electron pairing, the Dicke effect and the strong correlations is missing. We address this problem here for the Andreev-type setup, focusing on the low-energy $|\omega| < \Delta$ (subgap) regime. Our main purpose is to investigate the effect of electron pairing in presence of the side-attached QD_{±1}, ranging from the interferometric (weak coupling $t_{±1}$) to the molecular (strong interdot coupling) limits. We predict strong redistribution of the spectral weights (although manifested differently in each of these opposite extremes), that suppresses the low-energy quasiparticle states. Such transfer of the spectral weight turns out to have a constructive influence on the zero-bias Andreev conductance, due to the Kondo effect.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we introduce the microscopic model and outline the method describing the induced electron pairing. Sec. III refers




FIG. 1. Schematic view of three quantum dots (QD_i) arranged vertically between the normal (N) and superconducting (S) electrodes. The central QD₀ is coupled by Γ_β to the external reservoirs and by $t_{±1}$ to the side-attached QD_{±1}.

to the uncorrelated quantum dots and presents evolution of the central quantum dot spectrum from the weak to strong interdot coupling. In Sec. IV we study the correlation effects in the subgap Kondo regime. Next we summarize our results and in the Appendices we include useful details on: the normal heterostructures (A), effect of the finite superconducting gap (B), and influence of the energy detuning on the Kondo effect (C).

II. MICROSCOPIC MODEL

The central quantum dot (QD₀) coupled between the normal (N) and superconducting (S) electrodes with the side-attached quantum dots (QD_{±1}), as shown in Fig. 1, can be modelled by the Anderson-type Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_{QD} + \hat{H}_N + \hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_T. \quad (1)$$

Three quantum dots are represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{QD} = & \sum_{\sigma,i} \epsilon_i \hat{d}_{i\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{i\sigma} + \sum_{\sigma,i=\pm 1} \left(t_i \hat{d}_{0\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{i\sigma} + \text{h.c.} \right) \\ & + \sum_i U_i \hat{n}_{i\uparrow} \hat{n}_{i\downarrow}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{d}_{i\sigma}^{(\dagger)}$ annihilates (creates) electron of i -th quantum dot with energy ϵ_i and spin $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$. The second term in Eqn. (2) stands for lateral hybridization between the quantum dots, where $t_{\pm 1}$ is the hopping integral. As usually $\hat{n}_{i\sigma} = \hat{d}_{i\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{i\sigma}$ denotes the number operator. The Coulomb repulsion U_i between opposite spin electrons is responsible for the correlation effects.

The normal lead is treated here as free fermion gas $\hat{H}_N = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \xi_{\mathbf{k}N} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}N\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}N\sigma}$ and the superconductor is described by the BCS model $\hat{H}_S = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \xi_{\mathbf{k}S} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}S\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}S\sigma} - \sum_{\mathbf{k}} (\Delta \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}S\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{-\mathbf{k}S\downarrow}^\dagger + \text{h.c.})$, where $\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}\beta\sigma}^{(\dagger)}$ refer to electrons in $\beta = N, S$ electrode and Δ is the isotropic energy gap. Energies of the itinerant electrons are expressed with respect to the chemical potentials $\xi_{\mathbf{k}\beta} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mu_\beta$. We choose $\mu_S = 0$ as a convenient reference level. Electron tunneling between the central dot and the reservoirs is given by $\hat{H}_T = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma, \beta} (V_{\mathbf{k}\beta} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}\beta\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{0\sigma} + \text{h.c.})$, where $V_{\mathbf{k}\beta}$ denote the matrix elements. Since we are interested in a subgap quasiparticle states, we apply the wide-band limit approximation treating the couplings $\Gamma_\beta = 2\pi \sum_{\mathbf{k}} |V_{\mathbf{k}\beta}|^2 \delta(\omega - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\beta})$ as energy independent.

Transport properties of the considered heterostructure depend on effective spectrum of the central QD₀ which is a combined result of: the induced electron pairing, correlations and influence of the side-attached quantum dots QD_{±1}. Such properties can be inferred from the single particle Green's function

$$\mathbf{G}_i(t, t') = \begin{pmatrix} \langle \langle \hat{d}_{i\uparrow}(t); \hat{d}_{i\uparrow}^\dagger(t') \rangle \rangle & \langle \langle \hat{d}_{i\uparrow}(t); \hat{d}_{i\downarrow}(t') \rangle \rangle \\ \langle \langle \hat{d}_{i\downarrow}^\dagger(t); \hat{d}_{i\uparrow}^\dagger(t') \rangle \rangle & \langle \langle \hat{d}_{i\downarrow}^\dagger(t); \hat{d}_{i\downarrow}(t') \rangle \rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where $\langle \langle \hat{A}(t); \hat{B}(t') \rangle \rangle = -i\Theta(t-t') \langle [\hat{A}(t), \hat{B}(t')]_+ \rangle$ is the fermionic propagator. For a stationary case $\mathbf{G}_{i\sigma}(t, t') = \mathbf{G}_{i\sigma}(\tau)$, where $\tau = t - t'$. The Fourier transformed function $\mathbf{G}_i(\omega) \equiv \int d\tau e^{-i\omega\tau} \mathbf{G}_{i\sigma}(\tau)$ obeys the Dyson equation

$$[\mathbf{G}_i(\omega)]^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega - \epsilon_i & 0 \\ 0 & \omega + \epsilon_i \end{pmatrix} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\omega). \quad (4)$$

The first term on r.h.s. is the inversed bare Green's function of the isolated and uncorrelated quantum dot. The selfenergy matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\omega)$ accounts for the inter-dot couplings, effect of the external leads, and the correlations.

III. DICKE EFFECT VS PAIRING

We start our analysis by studying a relationship between the Dicke effect and electron pairing in absence of the correlations. In the main part we shall focus on the subgap regime $|\omega| \ll \Delta$, for which $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0(\omega)$ simplifies to

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{-i\Gamma_N}{2} + \sum_j \frac{t_j^2}{\omega - \epsilon_j} & -\frac{\Gamma_S}{2} \\ -\frac{\Gamma_S}{2} & \frac{-i\Gamma_N}{2} + \sum_j \frac{t_j^2}{\omega + \epsilon_j} \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$




FIG. 2. Electronic spectrum of the central QD obtained for $\Gamma_S = 2\Gamma_N$, $\delta = \Gamma_N$ and various interdot couplings t .




FIG. 3. Spectral function $\rho(\omega)$ of the uncorrelated QD₀ obtained in the molecular region $t = \delta = \Gamma_N$ for various couplings Γ_S , as indicated.

and summation runs over $j = \pm 1$. Other selfenergies are diagonal, with $\Sigma_{j,11}(\omega) = \frac{t_j^2}{\omega - \epsilon_0}$ and $\Sigma_{j,22}(\omega) = \frac{t_j^2}{\omega + \epsilon_0}$. Influence of the superconducting reservoir appears through the static off-diagonal terms in (5), which can be interpreted as the pairing potential. More general considerations, capturing a region outside the superconducting gap Δ , are presented in Appendix B.

A. From interferometric to molecular regions

In analogy to the previous studies of the three quantum dots on interface between both metallic electrodes^{9–11} we impose $t_{-1} = t_{+1} \equiv t$ and define the energy detuning as $\epsilon_{+1} - \epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0 - \epsilon_{-1} \equiv \delta$. Measurable charge tunnelling would be sensitive to the electronic spectrum of QD₀, therefore from now onwards we shall analyze influence of the electron pairing on the spectral function $\rho(\omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \{G_{0,11}(\omega + i0^+)\}$.

Fig. 2 shows it for $\Gamma_S = 2\Gamma_N$ and several values of the interdot coupling, ranging from the interferometric




FIG. 4. Splitting of the subradiant (Δ_c) and superradiant (Δ_s) quasiparticle states caused by the superconducting lead.

(small t) to the molecular (large t) regimes. For weak coupling $t = 0.1\Gamma_N$ we observe the Fano-type lineshapes, appearing at $\epsilon_{\pm 1}$ on top of the Andreev quasiparticles centered at $\pm\sqrt{\epsilon_0^2 + (\Gamma_S/2)^2}$. With increasing t the spectrum gradually evolves to the ‘molecular’ structure, characterized by the subradiant (narrow central quasiparticle) and superradiant (broad side-peaks) states. Similar effect has been reported for the heterojunction with normal leads^{9–11}. We observe, however, additional internal changes caused by the proximity effect. Fig. 3 presents evolution of the spectral function $\rho(\omega)$ with respect to Γ_S . Above some critical coupling $\Gamma_S \approx 0.6\Gamma_N$ the sub- and superradiant states effectively split (although in a way, dependent on t). Such splittings, denoted by Δ_c (for the central peak) and Δ_s (for the side peaks), are displayed in Fig. 4.

Furthermore, the particle-hole splitting of the central (subradiant) peak qualitatively differs from the corresponding effect of the side (superradiant) quasiparticle peaks (see the upper panel in Fig. 5). For the first case the symmetric shape is perfectly preserved, but with increasing Γ_S its internal splitting is bounded from above ($\Delta_c \rightarrow \delta$). Such limitation is imposed on Δ_c by the destructive quantum interference, which depletes the electronic states around $\epsilon_{\pm 1}$. On the other hand, the superradiant quasiparticle peaks are not affected by any constraints, therefore upon increasing Γ_S the magnitude of Δ_s monotonously grows. In distinction to the central peak we observe, however, that the superradiant states become asymmetric (with the narrow structure located slightly outside $|\epsilon_{\pm 1}|$ and another broader peak pushed to the high energy regime). In the extremely strong coupling limit Γ_S the high energy peaks absorb majority of the spectral weight.

On the other hand, in the interferometric regime (bottom panel in Fig. 5) we clearly see the Andreev quasiparticle states centered around $\pm\Gamma_S/2$ with the broadening Γ_N . Additionally, there appear the Fano-type lineshapes near $\omega = \epsilon_{\pm 1}$. Total spectral weight contained in the regime $\omega \in [\epsilon_{-1}, \epsilon_{+1}]$ is again washed out by the electron




FIG. 5. Electronic spectrum of the central QD₀ in the molecular $t = 1\Gamma_N$ (upper panel) and interferometric $t = 0.15\Gamma_N$ (bottom panel) regions obtained for $U = 0$, $\epsilon_0 = 0$, $\delta = \Gamma_N$.




FIG. 6. Spectral weight of the low energy electronic states $\omega \in [\epsilon_{-1}, \epsilon_{+1}]$ caused by the electron pairing for the interferometric (dashed line) and molecular (solid line) regions.

pairing. Transfer of the spectral weight of the molecular and interferometric cases is displayed in Fig. 6. We thus conclude, that the induced electron pairing depletes the low-energy quasiparticle states by transferring their spectral weight towards the higher energy quasiparticle states. In the molecular regime this process can have constructive influence on the Kondo effect (see Sec. IV).

IV. CORRELATION EFFECTS

The Coulomb interactions U_i induce additional important effects. For description of their influence it is convenient to express the Green's function $\mathbf{G}_i(\omega)$ via^{20,21}

$$\mathbf{G}_i(\omega) = \mathbf{G}_i^0(\omega) + \mathbf{G}_i^0(\omega) U_i \mathbf{F}_i(\omega), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{G}_i^0(\omega)$ corresponds to $U_i = 0$ case, and the two-body Green's function $\mathbf{F}_i(\omega)$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{F}_i(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \langle \langle \hat{d}_{i\uparrow} \hat{n}_{i\downarrow}; \hat{d}_{i\uparrow}^\dagger \rangle \rangle & \langle \langle \hat{d}_{i\uparrow} \hat{n}_{i\downarrow}; \hat{d}_{i\downarrow} \rangle \rangle \\ \langle \langle -\hat{d}_{i\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{n}_{i\uparrow}; \hat{d}_{i\uparrow}^\dagger \rangle \rangle & \langle \langle -\hat{d}_{i\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{n}_{i\uparrow}; \hat{d}_{i\downarrow} \rangle \rangle \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

In the remaining part of this section we analyze the correlation effects driven by the potential U_0 , because they would predominant affect the measurable transport properties. We neglect effects due to $U_{\pm 1}$, which could merely mimic the multilevel structure of the side-coupled dots. In experimental realizations of the correlated quantum dots coupled to the superconducting electrodes^{22–25} the Coulomb potential U_i usually exceed the superconducting energy gap Δ (by approximately one order of magnitude). Under such circumstances the correlation effects show up in a subgap regime $|\omega| < \Delta$ in a rather peculiar way, via (i) the singlet-doublet transition (or crossover) and (ii) the subgap Kondo effect^{25,26}.

The first effect can be accounted for using the lowest order (Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov) decoupling scheme

$$U_0 \mathbf{F}_0(\omega) \approx U_0 \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \langle \hat{n}_{0\downarrow} \rangle & \langle \hat{d}_{0\downarrow} \hat{d}_{0\uparrow} \rangle \\ \langle \hat{d}_{0\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{d}_{0\downarrow}^\dagger \rangle & -\langle \hat{n}_{0\uparrow} \rangle \end{pmatrix}}_{\Sigma_0^{1st}} \mathbf{G}_0(\omega). \quad (8)$$

The 1-st order correction (with respect to U_0) to the self-energy is static, therefore it can be incorporated to the effective energy level $\tilde{\epsilon}_0 \equiv \epsilon_0 + U_0 \langle \hat{n}_{0\sigma} \rangle$ and the effective pairing potential $\tilde{\Gamma}_S/2 \equiv \Gamma_S/2 - U_0 \langle \hat{d}_{0\downarrow} \hat{d}_{0\uparrow} \rangle$. Such Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov corrections (8) imply a crossing of the subgap Andreev states when the ground state changes from the spinful to spinless configuration upon increasing the ratio Γ_S/U_0 . This effect causes reversal of the tunnelling current in Josephson junctions (so called, $0 - \pi$ transition) and has been extensively studied (see Ref.²⁷ for comprehensive discussion).

In order to describe the many-body Kondo effect it is necessary to go beyond the mean field approximation, including the higher order (dynamic) corrections

$$U_0 \mathbf{F}_0(\omega) = \left[\Sigma_0^{1st} + \Sigma_0^{dyn}(\omega) \right] \mathbf{G}_0(\omega). \quad (9)$$

Eqn. (9) is formally equivalent to the Dyson equation $\mathbf{G}_0(\omega)^{-1} = \mathbf{G}_0^0(\omega)^{-1} - \left[\Sigma_0^{1st} + \Sigma_0^{dyn}(\omega) \right]$. Obviously $\Sigma_0^{dyn}(\omega)$ can be estimated only approximately, because the present problem is not solvable exactly.

For energies much smaller than the gap Δ of superconducting electrode the diagonal and off-diagonal parts of the Green's function $\mathbf{G}_0(\omega)$ are interdependent through the following (exact) relation

$$(\tilde{\omega} - \epsilon_0) \mathbf{G}_{0,11}(\omega) = 1 - \frac{\Gamma_S}{2} \mathbf{G}_{0,21}(\omega) + U_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,11}(\omega) \quad (10)$$

Here $\tilde{\omega} = \omega - \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{|V_{\mathbf{k}N}|^2}{\omega - \xi_{\mathbf{k}N}}$, which in the wide-band limit simplifies to $\tilde{\omega} = \omega + i\Gamma_N/2$. We determine the two-body propagator $\mathbf{F}_{0,11}(\omega) = \langle \langle \hat{d}_{0\uparrow} \hat{n}_{0\downarrow}; \hat{d}_{0\uparrow}^\dagger \rangle \rangle$ using the decoupling scheme within the equation of motion procedure²⁸

$$\mathbf{F}_{0,11}(\omega) \simeq \frac{\langle \hat{n}_{0\downarrow} \rangle - \gamma_1(\omega) \mathbf{G}_{0,11}(\omega)}{\tilde{\omega} - \epsilon_0 - U_0 - \gamma_3(\omega)}, \quad (11)$$

with the auxiliary functions

$$\gamma_\nu(\omega) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left[\frac{|V_{\mathbf{k}N}|^2}{\omega - \xi_{\mathbf{k}N}} + \frac{|V_{\mathbf{k}N}|^2}{\omega - U_0 - 2\epsilon_0 + \xi_{\mathbf{k}N}} \right] \times \begin{cases} f_{FD}(\xi_{\mathbf{k}N}) & \text{for } \nu = 1, \\ 1 & \text{for } \nu = 3. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

This method implies the diagonal part of $\Sigma_{0,11}(\omega) = \Sigma_{0,11}^{1st} + \Sigma_{0,11}^{dyn}(\omega)$ in the familiar form²⁸

$$\frac{1}{\omega - \epsilon_0 - \Sigma_{0,11}(\omega)} = \frac{1 - \langle \hat{n}_{0\downarrow} \rangle}{\tilde{\omega} - \epsilon_0 + \frac{U_0 \gamma_1(\omega)}{\tilde{\omega} - \epsilon_0 - U_0 - \gamma_3(\omega)}} + \frac{\langle \hat{n}_{0\downarrow} \rangle}{\tilde{\omega} - \epsilon_0 - U_0 + \frac{U_0 [\gamma_1(\omega) - \gamma_3(\omega)]}{\tilde{\omega} - \epsilon_0 - \gamma_3(\omega)}}. \quad (13)$$

The corresponding off-diagonal part $\Sigma_{0,21}(\omega)$ can be obtained from (10,11). Such procedure reproduces qualitatively the Kondo effect, whose spectroscopic signature is the Abrikosov-Suhl peak at $\omega = \mu_N$.

In the next subsection we investigate role played by the interdot coupling, from the interferometric (weak t) to the Dicke (strong t) regions and indicate feasible verification of our predictions by the Andreev spectroscopy.

A. Kondo effect: interferometric vs Dicke regions

Fig. 7 shows influence of the interdot coupling t on the spectrum QD₀ in the Kondo regime. Numerical results have been obtained at low temperature $T = 10^{-6}\Gamma_N$ for $\epsilon_0 = -2\Gamma_N$, $\delta = \Gamma_N$, $\Gamma_S = 4\Gamma_N$, assuming the large Coulomb potential $U_0 = 100\Gamma_N$. Initially, for $t = 0$, the spectral function $\rho(\omega)$ reveals: (i) the quasiparticle peak at $\omega \approx \epsilon_0$, (ii) its tiny particle-hole companion at $\omega \approx -\epsilon_0$ (let us remark that superconducting proximity effect substantially weakens upon increasing $|\epsilon_0|/\Gamma_S$) and (iii) the narrow Abrikosov-Suhl peak at $\omega = \mu_N$ (manifesting the Kondo effect). For weak interdot coupling $t \ll \Gamma_N$ we notice appearance of the Fano-type (interferometric) features at $\omega = \epsilon_{\pm 1}$. For larger t the spectrum of QD₀ evolves to its molecular-like structure, reminiscent




FIG. 7. Evolution of the spectral function $\rho(\omega)$ obtained for the strongly correlated QD₀ in the Kondo region from the interferometric (small t) to molecular (large t) limits. Calculations have been done for $\mu_N = 0$, $\epsilon_0 = -2\Gamma_N$, $\delta = \Gamma_N$, $\Gamma_S = 4\Gamma_N$ and $U_0 = 100\Gamma_N$.

of the one discussed in the preceding section. Upon increasing t the central (subradiant) quasiparticle centered around ϵ_0 gradually narrows, whereas the side- (superradiant) quasiparticles absorb more and more spectral weights. Such transfer of the spectral weight indirectly magnifies the Abrikosov-Suhl peak, appearing on the upper superradiant quasiparticle.

For the present case the Dicke effect has a constructive influence on the Kondo state. In general, however, fate of the Kondo effect would depend on detuning energy δ as well. For instance, for $\epsilon_{\pm 1} \rightarrow \mu_N$ and strong t the interdot coupling would completely suppress the Kondo effect because all electronic states near $\epsilon_{\pm 1}$ are washed out. We briefly address this issue in Appendix C.

B. Enhancement of the zero-bias conductance

Experimental verification of the subgap Kondo effect can be done by measuring the tunneling current, induced under nonequilibrium conditions $\mu_N - \mu_S = eV$ (where V is an applied voltage). At low voltage and low temperatures the subgap current is provided solely by the anomalous Andreev channel (when electrons are scattered as holes to N electrode injecting Copper pairs to superconducting electrode). Within the Landauer approach such current can be expressed by $I(V) = \frac{2e}{h} \int d\omega T_A(\omega) [f_{FD}(\omega - eV) - f_{FD}(\omega + eV)]$, where $f_{FD}(\omega) = [1 + \exp(\omega/k_B T)]^{-1}$ is the Fermi-Dirac distribution function. The effective Andreev transmittance $T_A(\omega) = \Gamma_N^2 |\mathbf{G}_{0,12}(\omega)|^2$ is a quantitative measure of the proximity induced pairing and it indirectly probes also the subgap electronic spectrum (although in a symmetrized manner, because the particle and hole degrees of freedom contribute equally to the Andreev scattering). Such transmittance depends on the Kondo effect and the quantum interference (for weak t) or Dicke-like effect (for




FIG. 8. Subgap Andreev conductance $G(V) = dI(V)/dV$ for a varying interdot coupling t , ranging from the weak (interferometric) to molecular (Dicke) regions. Calculations have been done for the same model parameters as in figure 7.

the strong interdot coupling).

Fig. 8 shows the differential conductance of our setup obtained at temperature $T \ll T_K$ as the function of bias V and the interdot coupling t . In absence of the side-attached dots we observe the broad maxima at $|eV| \approx \epsilon_0$ (corresponding to the Andreev quasiparticle states) and the zero-bias peak (due to the Kondo effect). For weak interdot coupling $t \ll \Gamma_N$, the quantum interference starts to play a role as manifested by the asymmetric Fano-type resonance near $\epsilon_{\pm 1}$. These features gradually expand when the system evolves to its molecular regime with increasing t . Transfer of the spectral weight from the subradiant to superradiant states amplifies the zero-bias conductance (shown as the bright region at $V \sim 0$).

V. SUMMARY

We have studied interplay between the proximity induced electron pairing and the Dicke-like effect in heterojunction, comprising three quantum dots vertically coupled to the normal and superconducting leads. In analogy to the normal heterostructures⁹⁻¹¹ the narrow (subradiant) and the broad (superradiant) contributions arise either (i) upon increasing the interdot coupling t or (ii) by reducing detuning δ of their energies. We have examined the internal electronic structure and redistribution of the spectral weights between the low- and high-energy states driven by the electron pairing.

For the weak interdot coupling t we observe the usual subgap quasiparticles (Andreev states) superimposed with the Fano-type interferometric lineshapes at $\omega = \epsilon_{\pm 1}$. On the other hand in the molecular region (i.e. for strong interdot coupling t) the sub- and superradiant states reveal the particle-hole splitting. The subradiant state is restricted to the energy region $\omega \in (\epsilon_{-1}, \epsilon_{+1})$ therefore its splitting is bounded from above. In consequence the strong electron pairing washes out its spectral




FIG. 9. Evolution of the spectral function $\rho(\omega)$ for varying interdot coupling, from the interferometric (small t) to the molecular (large t) regions.

weight, transferring it towards the superradiant states. This detrimental influence of electron pairing on the subradiant state can (for $\mu_N > \epsilon_{+1}$ or for $\mu_N < \epsilon_{+1}$) indirectly amplify the subgap Kondo effect, observable by the zero-bias Andreev conductance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the National Science Centre in Poland via the project DEC-2014/13/B/ST3/04451.

Appendix A: Sub- and superradiant states in normal heterostructures

We show how the molecular (i.e. three peak structure of QD_0 spectrum) gradually emerges from the interferometric (weak interdot coupling) scenario, when both electrodes are metallic^{9–11}. For simplicity we neglect the correlations and introduce the effective coupling $\Gamma_N + \Gamma_S \rightarrow \Gamma_N$. The selfenergy is diagonal, therefore we can restrict our considerations to

$$\lim_{U_0=0} \Sigma_{0,11}(\omega) = -i\frac{\Gamma_N}{2} + \frac{t^2}{\omega - \epsilon_{+1}} + \frac{t^2}{\omega - \epsilon_{-1}}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

The spectral function $\rho(\omega)$ calculated for several values of t is shown in Fig. 9. For small values of the in-

terdot coupling, the QD_0 spectrum reveals asymmetric Fano lineshapes²⁹ at $\omega\epsilon_{\pm 1}$. Such structures arise when a dominant (broad) transport channel interferes with a discrete (narrow) state, and can be realized in many areas of physics³⁰. In our case, the Fano resonances originate by combining a ballistic transport through the central QD_0 , with additional pathways to/from the adjacent $\text{QD}_{\pm 1}$.

By increasing t the Fano resonances gradually smoothen, and all electronic states nearby the $\text{QD}_{\pm 1}$ levels $\epsilon_{\pm 1}$ are effectively depleted. In consequence, this induces the three peak (molecular) structure reported in




FIG. 10. Evolution of the spectral function $\rho(\omega)$ with respect to the detuning energy δ obtained for the uncorrelated case ($U_i = 0$) in the normal heterostructure ($\Delta = 0$).

the previous studies¹¹. Further increase of the interdot coupling causes a transfer of the spectral weight from the central (subradiant) to the satellite (superradiant) quasiparticle states. Appearance of the narrow (subradiant) and broad (superradiant) quasiparticle states can be also induced by reducing the detuning δ for a fixed interdot coupling t (Fig. 10).

Appendix B: Effect of finite superconducting gap

It is also instructive to study how the side-attached quantum dots come along with the proximity induced electron pairing, when $\epsilon_{\pm 1}$ happen to be inside or outside the superconducting energy gap Δ . To simplify this discussion we again consider the uncorrelated case $U_i = 0$. Selfenergy of the central QD_0 is given by

$$\Sigma_0(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{-i\Gamma_N}{2} - \frac{i\Gamma_S}{2}\tilde{\rho}(\omega) + \frac{t_{+1}^2}{\omega - \epsilon_{+1}} + \frac{t_{-1}^2}{\omega - \epsilon_{-1}} & -\frac{i\Gamma_S}{2}\tilde{\rho}(\omega)\frac{\Delta}{\omega} \\ -\frac{i\Gamma_S}{2}\tilde{\rho}(\omega)\frac{\Delta}{\omega} & \frac{-i\Gamma_N}{2} - \frac{i\Gamma_S}{2}\tilde{\rho}(\omega) + \frac{t_{+1}^2}{\omega + \epsilon_{+1}} + \frac{t_{-1}^2}{\omega + \epsilon_{-1}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where $\tilde{\rho}(\omega)$ is the modified BCS density of states

$$\tilde{\rho}(\omega) = \begin{cases} \frac{\omega}{\sqrt{\Delta^2 - \omega^2}} & \text{for } |\omega| < \Delta, \\ \frac{i}{\sqrt{\omega^2 - \Delta^2}} & \text{for } |\omega| > \Delta. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B2})$$

Fig. 11 shows $\rho(\omega)$ of the central quantum dot asymmetrically coupled to the external leads $\Gamma_S \gg \Gamma_N$ (useful for




FIG. 11. Spectral function $\rho(\omega)$ of the uncorrelated QD₀ for $\epsilon_0 = 0$, $\Gamma_S = 0.5\Delta$, $\Gamma_N = 0.01\Delta$, $t = 0.15$ and several detunings $\delta = 1.5\Delta$ (top), 0.75Δ (middle), 0.25Δ (bottom panel).




FIG. 12. Spectral function of the correlated central quantum dot in the Kondo regime obtained for interferometric regime $t = 0.1\Gamma_N$, using $\epsilon_0 = -2\Gamma_N$, $\Gamma_S = 4\Gamma_N$, $U_0 = 100\Gamma_N$.

distinguishing the subgap Andreev states) in the weak interdot coupling regime (characterized by the Fano-type lineshapes). For large detuning $\delta > \Delta$ (top panel) we observe such Fano resonances formed on top of the contin-

uum. For $\delta = 0.75\Delta$ (middle panel) the interferometric features appear in the subgap regime, however they no longer resemble Fano-type lineshapes. For small detuning, comparable to the Andreev quasiparticle energies (in this case $\delta = 0.25\Delta$) we observe three structures with internal splittings. The later case is systematically studied in section II (Fig. 3).

Appendix C: Influence of detuning on Kondo effect

Energy levels $\epsilon_{\pm 1}$ of the side-attached quantum dots can be varied from negative to positive energies (with respect to μ_N). In the interferometric limit the Fano-type resonances show up at $\omega = \pm\epsilon_{\pm 1}$, due to particle-hole mixing (Fig. 12). The Kondo resonance seems to




FIG. 13. The same as in Fig. 12, but for $t = 2\Gamma_N$.

be rather unaffected by the adjacent dots energy levels, unless any interferometric pattern happens exactly at the Fermi energy. The Kondo peak is then entirely destroyed. In the molecular region (Fig. 13) the Abrikosov-Suhl peak seems to be emphasized by increasing detuning, up to some critical value $\delta_{crit} = \epsilon_{+1} - \epsilon_0$ (analogous to the interferometric case).

* szczepan.glodzik@gmail.com

† doman@kft.umcs.lublin.pl

¹ P.A. Orellana, G.A. Lara, and E.V. Anda, *Kondo and Dicke effect in quantum dots side coupled to a quantum wire*, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 193315 (2006).

² R.H. Dicke, *The effect of collisions upon the Doppler width of spectral lines*, Phys. Rev. **89**, 472 (1953).

³ T.V. Shahbazyan and M.E. Raikh, *Two-channel resonant tunneling*, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 17123 (1994).

⁴ B. Wunsch and A. Chudnovskiy, *Quasistates and their relation to the Dicke effect in a mesoscopic ring coupled to a reservoir*, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 245317 (2003).

⁵ T. Vorrath and T. Brandes, *Dicke effect in the tunnel current through two double quantum dots*, Phys. Rev. B **68**,

035309 (2003).

⁶ P.A. Orellana, M.L. Ladrón de Guevara, and F. Claro, *Controlling Fano and Dicke effects via a magnetic flux in a two-site Anderson model*, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 233315 (2004).

⁷ T. Brandes, *Coherent and collective quantum optical effects in mesoscopic systems*, Phys. Rep. **408**, 315 (2005).

⁸ M.L. de Guevara and P.A. Orellana, *Electronic transport through a parallel-coupled triple quantum dot molecule: Fano resonances and bound states in the continuum*, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 205303 (2006).

⁹ P. Trocha and J. Barnaś, *Dicke-like effect in spin-polarized transport through coupled quantum dots*, J. Phys.: Condens. Matt. **20**, 125220 (2008).

- ¹⁰ P. Trocha and J. Barnaś, *Kondo-Dicke resonances in electronic transport through triple quantum dots*, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 075424 (2008).
- ¹¹ E. Vernek, P.A. Orellana, and S.E. Ulloa, *Suppression of Kondo screening by the Dicke effect in multiple quantum dots*, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 165304 (2010).
- ¹² P.P. Baruselli, R. Requist, M. Fabrizio, and E. Tosatti, *Ferromagnetic Kondo effect in a triple quantum dot system*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 047201 (2013).
- ¹³ Q. Wang, H. Xie, Y.-H. Nie, and W. Ren, *Enhancement of thermoelectric efficiency in triple quantum dots by the Dicke effect*, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 075102 (2013).
- ¹⁴ L. Bai, R. Zhang, and C.-L. Duan, *Andreev reflection tunneling through a triangular triple quantum dot system*, Physica B **405**, 4875 (2010).
- ¹⁵ L. Bai, Y.-J. Wu, and B. Wang, *Andreev reflection in a triple quantum dot system coupled with a normal-metal and a superconductor*, phys. stat. sol. (b) **247**, 335 (2010).
- ¹⁶ C.-Z. Ye, W.-T. Lu, H. Jiang, and C.-T. Xu, *The Andreev tunneling behaviors in the FM/QD/SC system with intradot spin-flip scattering*, Physica E **74**, 588 (2015).
- ¹⁷ W.-P. Xu, Y.-Y. Zhang, Q. Wang, Z.-J. Li, and Y.-H. Nie, *Thermoelectric effects in triple quantum dots coupled to a normal and a superconducting leads*, Phys. Lett. A **380**, 958 (2016).
- ¹⁸ G.-Y. Yi, X.-Q. Wang, H.-N. Wu, and W.-J. Gong, *Nonlocal magnetic configuration controlling realized in a triple-quantum-dot Josephson junction*, Physica E **81**, 26 (2016).
- ¹⁹ X.-Q. Wang, G.-Y. Yi, and W.-J. Gong, *Dicke-Josephson effect in a cross-typed triple-quantum-dot junction*, Sol. State Commun. **247**, 12 (2016).
- ²⁰ J. Bauer, A. Oguri, & A.C. Hewson, *Spectral properties of locally correlated electrons in a Bardeen Cooper Schrieffer superconductor*, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **19**, 486211 (2007).
- ²¹ L. Li, Z. Cao, T.-F. Fang, H.-G. Luo, and W.-Q. Chen, *Kondo screening of Andreev bound states in a normal-quantum dot-superconductor system*, Phys. Rev. B **94**, 165144 (2016).
- ²² R.S. Deacon, Y. Tanaka, A. Oiwa, R. Sakano, K. Yoshida, K. Shibata, K. Hirakawa, and S. Tarucha, *Tunneling spectroscopy of andreev energy levels in a quantum dot coupled to a superconductor*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 076805 (2010).
- ²³ E.J.H. Lee, X. Jiang, R. Aguado, G. Katsaros, C.M. Lieber, and S. De Franceschi, *Zero-bias anomaly in a nanowire quantum dot coupled to superconductors*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 186802 (2012).
- ²⁴ J.-D. Pillet, P. Joyez, R. Žitko, and M.F. Goffman, *Tunneling spectroscopy of a single quantum dot coupled to a superconductor: from Kondo ridge to Andreev bound states*, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 045101 (2013).
- ²⁵ R. Žitko, J.S. Lim, R. López, and R. Aguado, *Shiba states and zero-bias anomalies in the hybrid normal-superconductor Anderson model*, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 045441 (2015).
- ²⁶ T. Domański, I. Weymann, M. Barańska, and G. Górski, *Constructive influence of the induced electron pairing on the Kondo state*, Sci. Rep. **6**, 23336 (2016).
- ²⁷ M. Žonda, V. Pokorný, V. Janiš, & T. Novotný, *Perturbation theory of a superconducting 0 - π impurity quantum phase transition*, Sci. Rep. **5**, 8821 (2015).
- ²⁸ H.J.W. Haug and A.-P. Jauho, *Quantum kinetics in transport and optics of semiconductors*, Springer-Verlag, (Berlin, Heidelberg, New York) (2008).
- ²⁹ U. Fano, *Effects of configuration interaction on intensities and phase shifts*, Phys. Rev. **124**, 1866 (1961).
- ³⁰ A.E. Miroshnichenko, S. Flach, and Y.S. Kivshar, *Fano resonances in nanoscale structures*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 2257 (2010).